

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful consideration of this application. Claims 1-20 are currently pending. Claims 1, 8, 10, 13, 16, and 19 are amended to further clarify the invention. Applicants have carefully and thoughtfully considered the Office Action and the comments therein. For the reasons given below, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

In the Office Action on pages 2-3, claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants present amended claim 19 that recites "a computer readable medium comprising software, which, when executed, causes the computer to perform the method of claim 1." Applicants believe that the recited computer readable medium complies with the written description requirement. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

In the Office Action on pages 3-4, claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for failing to sufficiently establish any computer component that manipulates the computer program product with any kind of functionality. As suggested by the Examiner, Applicants present amended claim 19 that recites "a computer readable medium comprising software, which when executed by a computer, causes the computer to perform the method of claim 1." Applicants believe that the recited

computer readable medium recites a statutory invention. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Office Action on pages 2-5, claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,724,475 to Kristen (hereinafter ‘Kristen’). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Per amended claim 1, Kristen fails to teach claim 1 for at least two reasons. First, Kristen does not disclose or suggest “storing same said audio/video data at a second, lower, spatial and/or temporal resolution for at least a second, later, time period.” The Office Action, on pages 4, asserts that Kristen teaches that older data can be placed on hold so as not to be overwritten by newer data (Kristen: column 15, lines 1-12) and thus multiple versions of the same data can be stored for later review (Kristen: column 15, lines 30-40). Kristen, however, teaches a replacement process that optimally utilizes a mechanical rotating storage medium. The video data being replaced on the mechanical rotating medium comes from a video selector. There are multiple cameras, each having a video stream, to feed the video selector. Kristen: Figures 4 and 8; column: 9, lines 7-16; column 10, lines 50-55. A video stream, as commonly known in the art, may be considered to be a pipe of audio/video data contents constantly being received and delivered. The replacement process of Kristen may hold older data in storage indefinitely or may replace older data, for example, in a sequential manner to reduce head seek to different areas of disk platters so as to minimize disk wear. Kristen: column 15, lines 24-50. Thus, the older data and newer data of Kristen are associated with at least one video stream at an older time point and a more recent time point,

respectively. Consequently, the older data and new data of Kristen have different recording contents. Therefore, regardless of the details of the replacement process, the older data and newer data of Kristen cannot be the same data. Hence, Kristen fails to disclose or suggest “storing same said audio/video data at a second, lower, spatial and/or temporal resolution for at least a second, later, time period.”

Second, Kristen does not disclose “storing said audio/video data at a second, lower, spatial and/or temporal resolution for at least a second, later, time period.” Kristen discloses a split resolution recording wherein a high resolution view can be captured along with an overall view. Kristen, Figure 32C; column 30, lines 42-53. However, Kristen's split resolution recording captures a high resolution and a low resolution at the same time point, not a later time point. Therefore, Kristen fails to disclose “storing said audio/video data at a second, lower, spatial and/or temporal resolution for at least a second, later, time period.”

Hence, Claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-15 and 18-20 are allowable over Kristen at least for being dependent on allowable claim 1.

Claim 16 recites features similar to those of claim 1, and is therefore allowable over Kristen for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 17 is allowable over Kristen for at least being dependent on allowable claim 16.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Michael A. Sartori, Ph.D.

Registration No.: 41,289
Yao Wang, Ph.D.

Registration No.: 61,757
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, DC 20043-9998
(202) 344-4000
(202) 344-8300 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant

DC2#1005766
MAS/YZW/pt